

## **Klamath Provincial Advisory Committee**

May 10, 2002

### **Summary Meeting Notes**

Aero Enterprises, Redding Airport, Redding, California

Teri Raml, DFO, Klamath Falls Resource Area  
Phil Detrich, FWS  
Mark Wheatley, Cal F&G  
Pat Higgins, Fisheries interest  
Petey Brucker (Alternate for Pat Higgins)  
Jack Sheehan, Winema NF (Alternate for Chuck Graham)  
Joseph Bower, Environmental interest  
Sally Wells, Environmental interest  
Lou Woltering, Six Rivers NF  
Garwin Yip, NMFS  
Jim Peña, Deputy Forest Supervisor Shasta-Trinity NF  
Lynn Jungwirth, "Other" interests  
Peg Boland, Klamath National Forest  
Lisa Swinney, Fremont NF/Lakeview BLM,  
Louis Randall, "Other" interests  
Ed Kupillas, Forest Products Industry  
Paula Yoon, "Other" interests  
Kath Collier, REO Representative

#### **Phil Detrich – Northern Spotted Owl Status**

**Presentation:** Phil gave a presentation covering:

- The history of Northern Spotted owl protection from the Interagency Scientific committee in 1989 through the Northwest Forest Plan FSEIS in 1994.
- Assumptions for habitat quantity and recent revised definitions and revised habitat acreage estimates
- The lawsuit that alleged agencies were not tracking effects to habitat to determine if 2.5% was being met.
- Research in the Willow Creek Study Area, Studies by Simpson Timber, and the NCASI Radio Telemetry study
- Conclusions: It appears that decline has slowed (ISC had said that it would take 30-40 years for recovery to begin).

#### **Comments/Questions:**

- *Suggestion: Consider Effectiveness monitoring as a future topic.*
- *Does decline assume displacement by other owls (barred owl)? Answer: Phil, will check on the answer to this.*

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None (unless the Committee wants to put the Effectiveness Monitoring topic on a future agenda).

### **Coho Salmon – Garwin Yip**

**Presentation:** Garwin summarized some of the lawsuits that NMFS has been involved in:

- 2002 Suit for this year's flows out of the Klamath Project– Judge Brown agreed with plaintiffs' legal arguments, but found that salmon would not be adversely affected by the government's current Klamath operations
- November 2000 suit by the National Assoc of Homebuilders on NMFS' critical habitat designations. NMFS agreed that they had not considered economic analysis – asked court to remand the designation of critical habitat. Southern Oregon/Northern California Coasts coho salmon designated critical habitat were not included in the lawsuit. It may take up to 2 years to do the economic analysis for the designate critical habitat of the 19 evolutionarily significant unite (ESUs).
- Listing/De- listing --- (26 ESUs of salmon and steelhead are listed, and NMFS is undergoing status reviews for 24 of the ESUs.

### **Comments/Questions:**

- *Ed Kupillas - Anything known about the annual production of smults/fingerlings? Pat Higgins gave info on some population sampling.*
- *How do ESU relate to Key Watersheds? ESUs are populations of fish closely related (regulatory designation) that don't directly correlate to key watersheds.*
- *If there are no goals (no recovery plan) how can NMFS determine status of populations? Trends are not known, but only have presence-absence info.*

*Will Socioeconomics be included with the economic analysis? What socioeconomic model will be used? Garwin didn't know the answer to the questions, but would report back to the PAC.*

WEB SITES: <http://www.nwr.noaa.gov>  
<http://swr.nmfs.noaa.gov>

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None

### **California Perspective on Coho Salmon - Mark Wheatley**

**Presentation:** Mark gave a presentation on the status of Coho in California including: (Refer to Handout # 1 – “Status of the Proposed Listing of Coho Salmon”)

- Listing of Coho (Threatened south of San Francisco, Endangered north of San Francisco)
- The criteria to evaluate the petition against (e.g., Watershed conditions)
- Suggestions for future management actions and the next steps,
- “Take” definition and Permit process (Contact Craig Martz with questions on CEQA and CESA), and
- Northwest California Watershed Assessment (5 Agencies)
- Cal F&G's Restoration Program – landmark legislation

WEB SITES: (for Department of Fish and Game) [www.dgf.ca.gov](http://www.dgf.ca.gov)

(for grant process) [www.drg.ca.gov/nafwf/fishgrant.html](http://www.drg.ca.gov/nafwf/fishgrant.html)

**Comments/Questions:**

*Mark - Information on the Oregon Water Trust may be helpful for California's efforts.*

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None

**Status on Survey and Manage Program - Paula Crumpton, Shasta-Trinity NF**

Presentation: Paula gave a slide presentation on the status on Survey and Manage Program including (Refer to Handout # 2 – “Survey & Manage: mitigation for obscure, rare species of old forests”):

- Surveys (Project Surveys, Site Management, Strategic Surveys)
- New ROD in January 2001 - Improvements included:
  1. Eliminated site management redundancy
  2. Review process
  3. Update categories
  4. Remove some species
  5. Add new species
- Local Survey Decisions: May decide that a small project that would not affect the species can proceed without some surveys)
- 18 new Protocols (88 previously) and Management Recommendations 123 (263 previously)
- Fire Management Amendment focus for prescribed fire only (Emphasized around communities at risk (300 foot zone)\1.5 mile zone around at-risk communities
- All the coordination may require months before a decision can be made.

**Comments/Questions:**

*Q - To make a decision of the fire plan does the local decision maker have to submit information to REO to get a decision?*

*A - No the decision can be made locally.*

*Clarification needed on whether we still need to survey within the 300 foot/1.5 miles buffer.*

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None

**Public Comment Period** – None Made

**Report From Regional Ecosystem Office - Kath Collier**

Kath described the REO organization (Small staff of 18 including GIS) to support field and discussed a package to help improve the NWFP. She provided a variety of handouts, which she very briefly discussed:

- “April 2002 RIEC Meeting Notes that discussed “Hot Topics”” (Handout # 3)
- “Agenda for the May 2002 RIEC Meeting” (Handout # 4)

- “Agenda for the May 2002 IAC Meeting” (Handout # 5)
- The *Thursday R6 Update* (May 2, 2002) that discusses the GAO review on National Fire Plan (Handout # 6)
- The Winter 2002 Forest Products Laboratory *Newsline* that discusses use of small diameter wood (Handout # 7)

Kath also made a presentation on REO website which is very user-friendly (508 compatible) and full of information. (Handout # 8 – “Interagency Advisory Committee – REO E-Government Report”)

**WEBSITE:** [www.reo.gov](http://www.reo.gov)

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None

### **Monitoring the National Fire Plan – Jim Peña**

Jim discussed the three of the Monitoring Indicators supplied by the PAC that were evaluated (data not available to address Indicator #4-8). See Handouts # 9, 10 & 11.

(Handout #9 – “National Fire Plan Accounting Indicators of Ecosystem Sustainability”)

(Handout #10 – “Draft 2002 WFHF Fuels Projects Cohesive Strategy Info 11/7/01”)

(Handout #11 – “FY2002 Program of Work, Fund: WFHF – Hazardous Fuels – Title II”)

New Employee (% of local hires) Contracts issued that included many local residents. Met the intent of trying to get the local population as employees. Recommend that the PAC carry this forward and not let it drop. It’s representative of the problem of having lost the mill capacity over the last 8 years. The forests cannot provide a consistent supply of jobs.

### **Comments/Questions:**

*Need more information on contractors – Who’s bidding, how do they fare, etc. – may need to help train.*

*Q - Are we looking at the effects of fuels treatment – Are we going too far with thinning; for example are we changing the microclimate and drying the site and reducing the effectiveness of the fuels reduction?*

*A - Research is studying this, not individual forests or BLM units.*

**Decisions:** None

**Followup Needed:** None

### **NWFP Accomplishments/Status Reports**

Units were asked to report on the status of watershed analysis, riparian reserve buffers primarily are they being designated at the ROD specified distances), timber outputs, and consultation on Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Comments are summarized here; no handout for some.

**Shasta Trinity - Jim Peña** (Handout #12 – “Shasta-Trinity National Forest – Forest Plan Accomplishments”)

Watershed assessments – 31 Watershed assessments completed, out of 63)

Riparian reserves - Using default buffer widths.

Timber Outputs – 1980's average 220 MMBF – PSQ 82 MMBF

<u>Year</u>	<u>MMBF</u>
FY 94	36
FY 95	52
FY 96	66
FY 97	80
FY 98	82
FY 99	33
FY 00	14
FY 01	86
FY 02	0

Consultation with FWS and NMFS

Great success with consultations and streamlining

**Redding RA** - Chuck Schultz (Jim Peña handed out information for Chuck - Handout #13)

Watershed assessments – 349,000 acres of watershed analysis completed in four areas (Indian Creek, Grass Valley Creek/Hoadley Gulch, Lower Clear Creek, and Trinity River Mainstem/Deadwood Creek) plus an ongoing analysis in Canyon Creek Key Watershed where Forest Service is the lead.

Riparian reserves - Using default buffer widths.

Timber Outputs - PSQ 1 MMBF

<u>Year (MMBF* Sold)</u>	<u>Regular Volume</u>	<u>Salvage Volume</u>	<u>Total Volume</u>
FY 94	----	----	----
FY 95	0.40	0.05	0.45
FY 96	0.61	0.03	0.63
FY 97	5.70	----	5.70
FY 98	----	0.04	0.04
FY 99	----	3.00	3.00
FY 00	0.77	0.11	0.87
FY 01	0.10	0.01	0.11
FY02 (Projected)	----	0.10	0.10

Consultation with FWS – (No input)

**Winema NF - Jack Sheehan**

Watershed assessments – 11 Watershed assessments completed, two others in process (neither on west side). Note: Jack, also handed out the list of watershed restoration projects (funded both by FS appropriated funds and County RAC funds).

Riparian reserves - Using default buffer widths.

Timber Outputs - PSQ 19 MMBF

<u>Year</u>	<u>MMBF</u>
FY 94	0
FY 95	16.5

FY 96	12.6
FY 97	18.0
FY 98	17.0
FY 99	1.0
FY 00	1.2
FY 01	1.6

Consultation with FWS – Level 1 teams are operating efficiently.

**Klamath National Forest - Peg Boland** (Handout #16)

Riparian reserves - Using default buffer widths

Watershed assessments – 6 key watersheds, 9 assessments within those areas. (8 assessments in non-key watersheds)

Year (MMBF* Sold)	Regular Volume	Salvage Volume	Total Volume
FY 94	----	----	----
FY 95	7.15	15.22	22.37
FY 96	10.46	42.54	53.01
FY 97	15.31	22.55	37.86
FY 98	38.15	2.13	40.28
FY 99	10.92	----	10.92
FY 00	----	15.40	15.40
FY 01	6.55	16.55	23.10

Consultation - Very good working relationships with both FWS and NMFS. They had 76 consultations with FWS and 787 with NMFS. Because of the high numbers they are now using more programmatic consultations so that each individual project doesn't have to be consulted on.

*Q - (Ed Kupillas) – Is there any “inter-unit” discussion on how to manage the resource if 400 MMBF are grown each year and you’re only harvesting 43 MMBF? A - (Peg) - We know we are growing more than we are harvesting, and are attempting, through the National Fire Plan fuel reduction activities and our regular timber program to make more of this growth available for harvest.*

**Klamath Falls RA – Teri Raml** (presented by Don Hoffheins) (Handout # 17)

Riparian reserves – Nine percent of Resource Area - Using default buffer widths except around some meadows where the buffer has been increased to promote wood recruitment into the meadow habitat.

Watershed assessments – 46% of the “Westside” of the Klamath Falls Resource Area are in Key watersheds. Watershed assessments have been completed for all lands covered by the Northwest Forest Plan (NFP).

Timber Outputs – Note: Table 6 in Handout #17 covered the entire Klamath Falls Resource Area. The following data are just for the “Westside” of the Resource Area that is covered by the NFP.

PSQ = 5.9 MMBF. Average Annual Accomplished 1995-2001 = 5.2 MMBF.

<u>Year</u>	<u>MMBF</u>
FY 94	--
FY 95	3.3
FY 96	7.1
FY 97	6.2
FY 98	5.9
FY 99	2.4
FY 00	9.3
FY 01	2.6
FY 02	--

Consultation - Very good working relationships with FWS. Typically use “streamlining” for consultation. Even on larger projects such as the Klamath River Management Plan EIS, FWS met early and periodically with the BLM, although formal consultation has not been initiated.

Don also handed out the BLM “FY 2000 Northwest Forest Plan Monitoring Report” and the BLM “FY 2001 Northwest Forest Plan Monitoring Report” as a comparison of the Klamath Falls Resource Area with other Western Oregon BLM Districts.

### **Lou Woltering for Six Rivers NF**

Watershed assessments – Approximately 77 percent of Key Watersheds completed.

Smith River Basin – Entire Basin

Klamath River Basin – 3 of the 5 Key watersheds

Trinity River Basin – All 3 of the Key watersheds

Costal Province has additional funding for doing WA on Lower Trinity, then Bluff Creek WA.

Riparian Reserves – At any given location within an IRR, the project specific buffer widths may vary between 50 to 150 ft depending on the terrain, the physical and biological processes occurring there, and the nature of the proposed project. The forest does manage within IRRs sometimes within 30 feet of an intermittent channel. However, in most instances, these are extremely small channels up on ridge tops that have only a small evidence of scour. For the most part, most of our IRR distances are closer to the ROD prescribed distances but we do usually manage within some portion of a given stream if the ACS will be maintained or benefited.

Timber Outputs – 12 MMBF, salvage 3MMBF (down because of Megram fire)

2001 volume was up as Offered, but they were shut down because of lawsuit.

Forest PNV inventory changed land base classification so they are reassessing the suitable base.

<u>Year (CCF* Offered)</u>	<u>Regular Volume</u>	<u>Salvage Volume</u>	<u>Total Volume</u>
FY 94			--
FY 95			--
FY 96			--
FY 97	17.1	11.5	28.6

FY 98	18.1	--	18.1
FY 99	0.96	0.25	1.21
FY 00	0.12	0.38	0.5
FY 01	--	0.97	0.97
FY 02			

\*Other units reported in MMBF

Consultation - Enjoy a very good working relationship with both FWS and NMFS. The Forest hasn't had a need for consultation on fuels management for community protection projects because they haven't had a "may affect" determination on any project.

### Comments/Questions:

*Phil – FWS is completing opinions again and adding substantially more analysis to these opinions to have better defense against litigation. Biological Opinions have improved a lot.*

*Lynn Jungwirth - Agencies should now have the information for basis of a watershed restoration plan. NWFP had a lot of emphasis on restoration. We've been tracking the timber outputs. Now can PAC see how restoration programs are looking? (Note: this could be put on a future agenda).*

*Paula Yoon - Document to see where different forests (units) are considering Watershed health.*

*Pat Higgins – We need water quality data to show what the effects are. The data are usually spotty - unsystematic approach. Will TMDL data help track that information. Yes it will help some by focusing efforts, but it will take time.*

*Joseph Bower – TMDL often cover watersheds that are primarily federal lands. The direction is to perform a substantial amount of upslope restoration, but there isn't money to implement.*

*Lynn Jungwirth - Legislation could put \$ into restoration, but if NEPA isn't done the work cannot be implemented.*

*Phil Detrich – the cost of doing environmental compliance is about 50% of total cost.*

*Petey Brucker - Often costs go to the watersheds that are most damaged but the science says that efforts should be put into the sites where habitat is still in relatively good condition.*

*Pat Higgins – Transportation planning should guide use in what the work priorities should be.*

*Jim Peña – This may not be a topic that the PAC can deal with. We don't have a consistent – coherent agreement of what the people want to do on the ground. We don't have much influence on what we are asked (funded) to do each year.*

*Mark Wheatley - CDF restoration program does have funding that can be used.*

**Decisions:** None



**Followup Needed:** No real follow-up on the topics presented is needed, but during the discussion the topic about restoration projects was brought up. This should be considered as a future agenda topic.

### **(New Topic) Socioeconomic Subcommittee - Paula Yoon**

An equitable basis of extrapolation of values needs to be used across the board to determine the socioeconomic situation. Paula attended PacifiCorp meeting on FERC relicensing along with Lynn Jungwirth, Alice Kilham and Teri. PacifiCorp basically said that communities in Lower Klamath and Coastal communities don't need to be considered in the relicensing according to FERC requirements. In the original licensing there was original intent to consider what would be lost with construction of the dam, but there wasn't any science to do it.

As Paula pointed out, the watershed paradigm has shifted – we now know that decisions that are made in a basin can affect coastal communities up and down the coast from the river mouth. FERC requirements are flawed because they don't require historical perspective. How can potential future project effects be incorporated into the relicensing process without addressing the changes that have occurred since the building of the dam? It begs the question – how do we recognize consequences if we don't acknowledge them.

Paula said that Todd Olsen, PacifiCorp, suggested looking at the area in the immediate vicinity as primary areas of consideration; and downriver and coastal areas to be looked as secondary areas. Given the larger need for a watershed plan that includes valid socioeconomic consideration, Paula thought this would be insufficient initial analysis. She will write up her comments and provide them to the socioeconomic subcommittee members as a response to PacifiCorp's first socioeconomic draft.

### **Summer Field Trip**

Klamath NF will host June 12 & 13. A Westside project will be visited, maybe fuels reduction.

### **PAC membership**

Approved for 30 members.

Bob Davis (BOR) and others have not attended and have asked to be removed from the PAC member list.

#### *Suggestions for membership*

Can we include "unrecognized" tribes?

Other counties

Siskiyou County Tourism

Restoration Groups and restoration workers

Recreation/Tourism – Lou knows Willow Creek residents that may fill the open slot

Check into if Jerry Brown still wanting to come to the meetings.

NCIDC - Northern California Indian Development Council

AFRC (American Forestry Resources Council) – Jeff Bryant

Society of American Foresters

County Economic Coordinators

Chamber of Commerce people

**Next Meeting**

**September 11-12 in Redding. Specific location TBA\*.**

\* (Note from Garwin Yip: There was also a mini-discussion about meeting location and why it has not been rotating around the province. Per discussion at a previous meeting, the desire of the majority of the PAC was to continue having the meetings in Redding.)